

## **REMARKS**

### **Allowance of Claims**

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's allowance of Claims 28-29, 31-33, 35-37, 40-41, 43, 45-51, 57-60, 66-69 and 74-77.

Applicants have the following response to the remaining rejections in the Office Action.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 7, 9, 53 and 62 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Inoue (US 6,469,455). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application and to clarify the claimed invention, Applicants are amending independent Claim 7 to recite the feature of "wherein the display portion and the driver circuit do not comprise a p-channel type semiconductor element." This feature is supported by, for example, page 5, lines 18-23 in the specification of the present application.

In contrast, the Examiner cites to Figs. 4 and 6 in Inoue. However, Figs. 4 and 6 in Inoue disclose two p-channel MOSFETs 51, 52. Therefore, Inoue does not meet the claimed feature of "wherein the display portion and the driver circuit do not comprise a p-channel type semiconductor element."

Therefore, independent Claim 7 is not disclosed or suggested by Inoue, and Claim 7 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over Inoue. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

### Claims Rejections - 35 USC §103

The Examiner further rejects Claims 8, 10 and 70 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue in view of Wagner et al. (US 6,670,599). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for independent Claim 7, each of these claims is also patentable over Inoue.

In addition to the above reasons, Wagner also does not disclose or suggest the claimed feature of “wherein the display portion and the driver circuit do not comprise a p-channel type semiconductor element.”

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

### Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants are submitting an information disclosure statement (IDS) herewith. It is respectfully requested that this IDS be entered and considered prior to the issuance of any further action on this application.

### Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: September 8, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/

Mark J. Murphy

Registration No. 34,225

COOK ALEX LTD.

200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850

Chicago, Illinois 60606

(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568